


EXPRESS EV42503895 US

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY



From the  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:  
JOSEPH S. TRIPOLI  
THOMSON LICENSING INC.  
2 INDEPENDENCE WAY SUITE 2  
PRINCETON, NJ 08540

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY  
EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Rule 71.1)

Date of Mailing  
(day/month/year)

30 APR 2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference

PU020085

IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION

International application No.

PCT/US03/10271

International filing date (day/month/year)

03 April 2003 (03.04.2003)

Priority date (day/month/year)

04 April 2002 (04.04.2002)

Applicant

DAVENPORT

1. The applicant is hereby notified that this International Preliminary Examining Authority transmits herewith the international preliminary examination report and its annexes, if any, established on the international application.
2. A copy of the report and its annexes, if any, is being transmitted to the International Bureau for communication to all the elected Offices.
3. Where required by any of the elected Offices, the International Bureau will prepare an English translation of the report (but not of any annexes) and will transmit such translation to those Offices.
4. **REMINDER**

The applicant must enter the national phase before each elected Office by performing certain acts (filing translations and paying national fees) within 30 months from the priority date (or later in some Offices)(Article 39(1))(see also the reminder sent by the International Bureau with Form PCT/IB/301).

Where a translation of the international application must be furnished to an elected Office, that translation must contain a translation of any annexes to the international preliminary examination report. It is the applicant's responsibility to prepare and furnish such translation directly to each elected Office concerned.

For further details on the applicable time limits and requirements of the elected Offices, see Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230

Authorized officer

BRIAN P. YENKE

Telephone No. (703)305-9871

# INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION TREATY

## PCT

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>PU020085</b>	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. <b>PCT/US03/10271</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>03 April 2003 (03.04.2003)</b>	Priority date (day/month/year) <b>04 April 2002 (04.04.2002)</b>
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC <b>IPC(7): HO4N 9/64 and US Cl.: 348/571, 575, 720, 721</b>		
Applicant <b>DAVENPORT</b>		
<p>1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of <u>5</u> sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).</p> <p>These annexes consist of a total of <u>0</u> sheets.</p>		
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Basis of the report</li> <li>II <input type="checkbox"/> Priority</li> <li>III <input type="checkbox"/> Non-establishment of report with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</li> <li>IV <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of unity of invention</li> <li>V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</li> <li>VI <input type="checkbox"/> Certain documents cited</li> <li>VII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain defects in the international application</li> <li>VIII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain observations on the international application</li> </ul>		
Date of submission of the demand <b>30 October 2003 (30.10.2003)</b>	Date of completion of this report <b>21 April 2004 (21.04.2004)</b>	
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer <b>BRIAN P. YENKE</b> Telephone No. (703)305-9871	

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International Application No.

PCT/US03/10271

## I. Basis of the report

### 1. With regard to the elements of the international application:\*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed.
- ☒ the description:  
 pages 1-16 as originally filed  
 pages NONE, filed with the demand  
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☒ the claims:  
 pages 17-20, as originally filed  
 pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19  
 pages NONE, filed with the demand  
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☒ the drawings:  
 pages 1-4, as originally filed  
 pages NONE, filed with the demand  
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:  
 pages NONE, as originally filed  
 pages NONE, filed with the demand  
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of \_\_\_\_\_.

### 2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language \_\_\_\_\_ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

### 3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

### 4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages NONE
- ☐ the claims, Nos. NONE
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE

### 5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).\*\*

\* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17).

\*\* Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International Application No.  
PCT/US03/1

## V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

### 1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)

Claims 3,7,9,10,11,18 and 22 YES

Claims 1,2,4-6,8,12-17, 19-21 and 23-24 NO

Inventive Step (IS)

Claims NONE YES

Claims 1-24 NO

Industrial Applicability (IA)

Claims 1-24 YES

Claims NONE NO

### 2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Please See Continuation Sheet

**Supplemental Box**

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

**V. 2. Citations and Explanations:**

Claims 1-2,4-6,8, 12-17, 19-21 and 23-24 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Van Der Wal et al US 6,188,381). Van Der Wal teaches a "Modular Parallel-Pipelined Vision System For Real-Time Video Processing", which includes a Processor Motherboard (PM) 10 (first module) which includes signal processors 1-4 (Fig 1) which communicates with Video Processor Motherboards (20) (Fig 1, col 5, line 66 to col 7 line 31)(second module) utilizing the global control bus 40 and the global video bus 30. The primary function of the PM 10 is to provide the command and control of video processing operations that are performed by the VPM's 20 and their VPD's 22-28. The PM 10 also includes a power on initialization with respect to the VPM's 20.

Claims 3, 7, 9,10,11,18 and 22 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Van Der Wal et al (US 6,188,381). Van Der Wal discloses a system which includes a primary motherboard 10 which includes 4 digital signal processor's which control for display a variety of video processor motherboards 20 utilizing the global control bus 40 and the global video bus 30. Van Der Wal does not specifically disclose the components of the system, being active/passive, or including an personality pin, field programmable gate array. The use of active and/or passive components in the design of a system is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use active and/or passive circuitry in the design of the modular parallel-pipelined vision system, since the designer has to active/passive components which are available off the shelf. Regarding claim 18 and the selling price of a unit in regards to access, is not inventive since compatibility between modules, if they are connected will have access based on the module type and input/output characteristics, price being a factor which changes the unit's cost, not the compatibility between devices.

**Applicant's statements:**

- a) Van Der Wal does not teach/suggest the first module detects or determines an input-output characteristic of the second module.
- b) Van Der Wal does not teach/suggest having a controller select one of a plurality of processing schemes based on a characteristic of the second module.
- c) Van Der Wal does not teach/suggest a first module that determines a signal-processing characteristic of the second module.
- d) Van Der Wal does not teach/suggest a video processing apparatus that includes a signal processor that establishes a signal-processing characteristic from one of a plurality of such characteristics stored in memory.
- e) Van Der Wal does not teach/suggest the desirability of enabling less than all features in a signal processing apparatus.
- f) Van Der Wal does not teach/suggest access to one of the signal processing characteristics in accordance with the selling price of the processing apparatus.

**Examiner's Response:**

- a-d) Van Der Wal discloses a system which contains video processing daughterboards (VPD) which can range from very



# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International Application No.  
PCT/US03/16271

## Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

specific video processing functions, such as a video digitizer, video display, to a range of dedicated video processing functions such as image correlations and image warping or special image storage functions or can include general processor such as one or more DSPs (col 4, line 52-62). The video processing system (VPS) also includes at least one general purpose processing module (PM) with up to four processor , which controls all the functions in the VPS providing control and/or data interface to the external world, and providing general purpose processing to data that was first processed by the video processing functions of the VPS. The system also includes a global control bus that passes control data from a hardware control library of the PM to the VPMs which allows for on the fly programming used to perform many of the processing functions of the VPMs. Van Der Wal also discloses that PM 10 functions as the microprocessor of the VPS, provides additional processing imagery that cannot be performed more efficiently using the available dedicated hardware and the last function is communications (col 6, line 42-65). Van Der Wal discloses that VPS is configured with video inputs and outputs and also communications such as RS-232 for serial data communications and Ethernet. Therefore in order for PM (1st module) to control the VPM's (2nd modules) which may have different inputs/outputs, the PM would have to detect/determine the input/output of each respective VPM in order to control the VPS using the global control bus 40 and global video bus 30. Each VPD (of VPM's) has dedicated crosspoint switch inputs and outputs and is also controlled through memory mapped control registers. Thus PM 10 does control the control/data between PM and VPM's where the PM knows/determines/detects which VPM's to activate in order to control the hardware/software of the entire video processing system using control data and also facilitating communications to external devices. Since the VPM's can perform different processing functions, and since the PM controls the VPM's the PM would have to know/determine the input/output, signal processing characteristic of each VPM based on a plurality of different processes available (as stated above). Regarding the enabling of less than all features, if the PM's along with the VPM's are not required to perform all the functions (i.e digitizer or image correlation as stated above) then obviously the PM would desirably not implement a function that it was capable of performing.

Regarding the selling the price, the applicant has argued what the claim is intended to mean. However, given what the claim actually states, the examiner maintains his original position.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----  
NONE